EXHIBIT 8

2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor Tel 202.261.1000
Washington, D.C. 20036-3307 Fax 202.887.0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
ATTORNEYS

DID: (202) 261-1030
Email: sbenson@mdslaw.com
www.mdslaw.com

February 22, 2008

BY FACSIMILE
Jessica L. Papazian-Ross, Esq.
Visconti & Boren Ltd.
55 Dorrance Street
Providence, RI 09203

Re: Consorzio v. Daniele, Inc.

Dear Jessica:

This letter concerns your responses to our first interrogatories and document requests.

In your response, you suggested that the documents produced were labeled as to which document request they pertain to, but the documents were not so labeled. We have been able to match the documents to the requests, based on the Bates numbers you indicated in your response. However, a few documents had no Bates numbers. They are attached hereto. Please identify them, stamp them, and indicate to which document request they are responsive.

Also, you produced documents that appear to be invoices for labels (beginning at Bates No. 334) which are not mentioned in your response. Please describe these documents and indicate to which request they are responsive.

With respect to your refusal to answer requests that you say are affected by your motion to stay, there is no basis for your refusal. All of our requests are relevant to Count I of the Complaint, namely, breach of the Settlement Agreement. Interrogatory No. 10 goes to whether Defendant's "trademarks" are trademarks or merely descriptive and grade or type designations. Interrogatories Nos. 11 and 13 go to whether these "trademarks" have been used or promoted in connection with bona fide sales of prosciutto, which is pertinent to whether they are legitimate trademarks. Interrogatory No. 16 seeks information relevant to whether Defendant used its old labels after the date specified in paragraph 8 of the Settlement Agreement. Interrogatory No. 22 is pertinent to Plaintiff's claim that Defendant's breach of the Settlement Agreement has caused injury to Plaintiff.

Likewise for our document requests. Request No. 8 relates to Defendant's actions and intentions regarding the Consorzio; we are willing to limit the request to market research leading up to and beyond the Settlement Agreement, namely, from August 2003 to the present. Request No. 9 goes to whether Defendant's "trademarks" are trademarks or merely descriptive and grade or type designations. Request No. 11 goes to any effort by Defendant to create confusion in breach of the Settlement Agreement, as well as its intentions in negotiating the Agreement. Requests Nos. 23 and 24 go to whether Defendant's "trademarks" have been used or promoted in connection with bona fide sales of prosciutto, which is pertinent to whether they are legitimate trademarks. Request No. 26 goes to Defendant's intentions in negotiating and complying with the Settlement Agreement and whether its "trademarks" are viewed as trademarks in the market. Requests Nos. 27 and 28 are pertinent to Plaintiff's claim that Defendant's breach of the Settlement Agreement has caused injury to Plaintiff. Request No. 38 goes to whether Defendant's "trademarks" are trademarks or are merely grade or type designations. Request No. 41 goes to whether Defendant's "trademarks" have been treated as trademarks (in any event, Defendant itself has cited its recent applications for registration, apparently as evidence that they are trademarks; see your response to Plaintiff's Interrogatories Nos. 6 and 7).

With respect to documents for which you claim attorney work product or attorney-client privilege, you have not identified the documents or provided the information requested and required by Fed. R. Civ. Proc. § 26(b)(5)(A). Please do so without further delay. We also reiterate that facts are not protected from discovery merely because they are contained in communications with attorneys. We expect you to provide all facts responsive to our requests. If you fail to provide facts in discovery and later seek to introduce them as evidence at trial, we will seek to have them barred.

Also, we reiterate our request to be provided with confidential documents pursuant to the protective order. You have produced some documents marked "Confidential." There is no basis on which to withhold any other such documents. With respect to those, we will proceed with a motion to compel, given your position.

We have additional comments and questions on several specific requests, as follows.

Interrogatory No. 2: The response includes no one knowledgeable about Defendant's product specifications. This subject is pertinent to Plaintiff's claim that the alleged trademarks are merely descriptive terms and grade or type designations, and are therefore not trademarks. This goes to Defendant's compliance with the Settlement Agreement. Please provide the person knowledgeable on this subject.

Interrogatory No. 5: This interrogatory covered not only advice from attorneys, but also advice from non-attorneys. Your response mentions only attorneys. We therefore assume that no other person gave advice covered by this request. If that is so, please confirm.

Interrogatory No. 8: In this request, we are seeking communications and other documents generated prior to this litigation. They would include, for example, discussions and plans concerning whether and how to use these terms as trademarks. Also, we take your refusal to provide us with legal advice concerning these terms to mean that Defendant will not claim in defense of this case that it received legal advice that these terms are valid trademarks.

Document Request No. 1: We see one label for Deli-Cut-O, which appears to be for packages of pre-sliced product. We do not see a label for Deli-Cut-O bulk prosciutto. Please explain or provide.

Document Request No. 3: We explained in our letter of January 22, 2008 the relevance of this request. We will be forced to move to compel production of responsive documents, namely copies of orders. In the alternative, we can agree to inspect files on site and copy only representative documents, subject as appropriate to the protective order.

Document Request No. 4: Same as our comment on Request No. 3.

Document Request No. 5: We do not see how this request can be overly burdensome. In part, it seeks documents generated in the process of determining whether to use these terms as trademarks. For the rest, we seek any documents in which these terms are used or discussed as trademarks. We have requested separately copies of product orders and invoices. If other documents exist in which Defendant uses its trademarks, please identify the types of documents and provide copies or, if they are too numerous, we are prepared to inspect them on site. If there are no such documents between or generated by non-lawyers, please so state.

Document Request No. 15: The documents requested go to whether and how Defendant's alleged trademarks have been used as trademarks, or not, including during the period in which the Settlement Agreement was negotiated. In addition, the response should not be overly burdensome; Defendant has represented in the past that its promotional materials consist entirely or mainly of its website and brochures. Please identify and provide copies of any promotional documents from August 1, 2003 to the present, as requested.

Document Request No. 17: We explained the relevance of this request in our letter of January 22, 2008. To assess your claim that this request is overly burdensome, we need to know what types of documents would be responsive to the request. If Defendant has extensive files of correspondence with its customers and resellers, we can inspect them on site. If you insist on not producing responsive documents going back to August 1, 2003, please provide or identify documents from the date of the Settlement Agreement forward and we will move to compel the earlier documents.

Document Request No. 18: As explained in our letter of January 22, 2008, this request is pertinent in that it seeks documents from the time of the negotiation of the 2005 Settlement Agreement.

Document Request No. 19: As explained in our letter of January 22, 2008, this request is reasonable and relevant, and should not be burdensome. Please indicate if other documents exist.

Document Request No. 20: As explained in our letter of January 22, 2008, this request is pertinent in that it seeks documents from the time of the negotiation of the 2005 Settlement Agreement.

Document Request No. 29: You continue to misinterpret this request. It only asks for copies of orders for labels and packages. This is pertinent to Defendant's compliance with paragraph 8 of the Settlement Agreement.

Document Request No. 30: Same as our comment on Request No. 29.

Document Request No. 39: As explained in our letter of January 22, 2008, this request goes to Defendant's claim that its "trademarks" are valid trademarks. Documents generated or received in the process of designing or adopting them as trademarks are relevant. There cannot be so many such documents as to create an undue burden.

Document Request No. 42: We are willing to limit this request to drafts and changes to the website since the execution of the Settlement Agreement.

Sincerely yours,

Stuart E. Benson

cc: Matthew F. Medeiros, Esq.

Daniele, Inc.
105 Davis Drive, P.O. Box 106
Pascoag, Rhode Island 02859
jm
(401) 568 - 6228 Fax: (401) 568 - 4788

CONFIDENTIAL

PURCHASE ORDER

Show this Purchase Order Number on all
Show this Purchase Order Number on all correspondence, invoices and shipping papers

DATE: 2/13/200
jm
No 14444

Issued To:

Telephone 401-568 -1110 **Fax** 401-568-1131
Contact jason / diane **E-Mail**

Ship
STEDAGIO
1000 DANIELE DRIVE

PASCOAG RI 02859
Telephone 401-568-6228 **Fax** 401-567-0888
Contact Joe Markey **E-Mail** joem@danielefoods.com

Date Needed: 2/22/2008 Ship Via:

Terms:

To Be Completed By Receiving Dept.

Stock Number/ Description	Qty. Ordered	U/M	Unit Price	Total	#Ctns	Qty	Condition of Containers
PS - 1416 - 44 Riserva Prosciutto Panino Points 12 oz proudly made in the USA	10.00	m					
PS - 1416 - 46 Riserva Prosciutto Panino Bites 12 oz proudly made in the USA	10.00	m					
PS - 1416 - 49 Riserva Prosciutto Panino Bites 4 oz proudly made in the USA	10.00	m					

NOTES:

NOTES (Indicate use of reverse side if more space is needed)

Order Taken By: jason / diane **DATE:**

Purchase Authorized **DATE:** 2/13/2008

STEDAGIO

Received By: Date:

Notify Purchasing Dept Immediately to Report
Any Damage or Evidence of Mis-Handling
Attach Packing Slip, Shipping Papers, B/L, Etc.
Distribute to the Purchasing Dept

Jessica Papazian-Ross

From: joem@danielefoods.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 1:56 PM
To: Jessica Papazian-Ross; 'Rich ST.Pierre'; fanin@aol.com
Subject: FW: Invoicing

Jessica,
This is for your files. This was sent to Pack All on February 6.

Joseph Markey

From: joem@danielefoods.com [mailto:joem@danielefoods.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2008 4:38 PM
To: 'kris.patrick@packall.com'
Subject: Invoicing

Kris,
All invoicing should come to us as Daniele, Inc. This change is effective Immediately.

Thank You

Joseph Markey

Jessica Papazian-Ross

From: joem@danielefoods.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 1:54 PM
To: Bill.Finnegan@sealedair.com; Robin.Allman@sealedair.com
Cc: Jessica Papazian-Ross; 'Rich ST.Pierre'; fanin@aol.com
Subject: Invoicing

Bill,
Please make sure that all invoices coming to Daniele are invoiced to Daniele Inc.

Thank You

Joseph Markey

Jessica Papazian-Ross

From: joem@danielefoods.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 1:52 PM
To: 'Diane Corrao'; 'Jason Mountford'; 'Misti Mountford'
Cc: Jessica Papazian-Ross; 'Rich ST.Pierre'; fanin@aol.com
Subject: Invoicing to Daniele

Diane,
Please make sure that any invoicing coming to Daniele, is billed to Daniele Inc.

Thank You

Joseph Markey

2000 M Street, NW 7th Floor Tel 202.261.1000
Washington, D.C. 20036-3307 Fax 202.887.0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO:	Jessica L. Papazian-Ross	FAX:	401.421.9302
OF:	Visconti & Boren, Ltd.	PHONE	401.331.3800
FROM:	Stuart E. Benson	PHONE:	202.261.1000
DATE:	February 22, 2008	CLIENT NO:	

NUMBER OF PAGES: 9 (including cover)

MESSAGE:

THIS MESSAGE MAY CONTAIN PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED SOLELY FOR THE INDIVIDUALS OR ENTITIES TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED. IF YOU ARE NOT THE ADDRESSEE OR THE EMPLOYEE OF THE ADDRESSEE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DELIVERY OF THIS MESSAGE, PLEASE NOTE THAT ANY DISSEMINATION OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE OR DISCLOSURE OF ITS CONTENTS IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US BY PHONE FOR INSTRUCTIONS ON ITS RETURN OR DISPOSAL.

THANK YOU.

MESSAGE CONFIRMATION

FEB-22-2008 10:44 AM FRI

FAX NUMBER : 2028870336
NAME : MANELLI DENISON

NAME/NUMBER : 1030#95247#14014219302#
PAGE : 9
START TIME : FEB-22-2008 10:42AM FRI
ELAPSED TIME : 01'30"
MODE : STD ECM
RESULTS : [O.K]

2000 M Street, NW 7th Floor Tel 202.261.1000
Washington, D.C. 20036-3307 Fax 202.887.0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO: Jessica L. Papazian-Ross FAX: 401.421.9302

OF: Visconti & Boren, Ltd. PHONE 401.331.3800

FROM: Stuart E. Benson PHONE: 202.261.1000

DATE: February 22, 2008 CLIENT NO:

NUMBER OF PAGES: 9 (including cover)

MESSAGE:

THIS MESSAGE MAY CONTAIN PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED SOLELY FOR THE INDIVIDUALS OR ENTITIES TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED. IF YOU ARE NOT THE ADDRESSEE OR THE EMPLOYEE OF THE ADDRESSEE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DELIVERY OF THIS MESSAGE, PLEASE NOTE THAT ANY DISSEMINATION OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE OR DISCLOSURE OF ITS CONTENTS IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US BY PHONE FOR INSTRUCTIONS ON ITS RETURN OR DISPOSAL.

THANK YOU.